

C6ceeidc

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
3 -----x

4 E.I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND  
5 COMPANY,

6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 12 MC 120-P1

9 KOLON INDUSTRIES, INC.,  
10 et al.,

11 Defendants.

12 -----x

13 June 12, 2012

14 10:20 a.m.

15 Before:

16 HON. JOHN G. KOELTL,

17 District Judge

18 APPEARANCES

19 KOBRE & KIM

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff

21 BY: MICHAEL SANGYUN KIM

22 MARCUS GREEN

23 PAUL HASTINGS, LLP

24 Attorneys for Defendant Kolon Industries

25 BY: GLENN D. DASSOFF

TRACHTENBERG, RODES & FRIEDBERG

Attorneys for Garnishees

BY: DAVID TRACHTENBERG

STEPHEN ARENA

C6ceeidc

1 (In open court)

2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Du Pont vs. Kolon. All parties  
3 please state who they are for the record.

4 MR. KIM: Good morning, your Honor. Michael Kim and  
5 Marcus Green, Kobre & Kim for Du Pont.

6 THE COURT: Good morning.

7 MR. DASSOFF: Good morning, your Honor. Glenn Dassoff  
8 for Paul Hastings, LLP, specially appearing for Kolon  
9 Industries, Inc. And with me, my colleague, also specially  
10 appearing, Abigail Lloyd.

11 MR. TRACHTENBERG: Good morning, your Honor. David  
12 Trachtenberg, Trachtenberg, Rodes & Friedberg, and Stephen  
13 Arena for Shinhan Bank and Shinhan Financial.

14 THE COURT: Good morning, all. Good to see you all.

15 I should point out, it occurred to me that I have a  
16 friend who worked at Du Pont's counsel's office in Delaware. I  
17 believe he's retired now. Nothing about that affects anything  
18 that I do in the cases.

19 All right. There are three motions pending before me  
20 today. There is the turnover motion against Kolon. There is  
21 the status quo motion against Kolon. And there's the motion to  
22 compel compliance from Shinhan.

23 I'm familiar with the papers. I'm prepared to listen  
24 to argument. Mr. Kim?

25 MR. KIM: Thank you, your Honor.

C6ceeidc

1                   Your Honor, I was giving thought, in preparation for  
2 addressing the Court, as to what areas I think the parties  
3 could have done a better job briefing that I could address  
4 orally that might be of assistance to the Court in rendering  
5 its decision. So I thought that I would focus most of the  
6 discussion on the agency branch of the personal jurisdiction  
7 cases, and in particular, how factually, if one were to apply  
8 it to this case, the picture looks, and in particular with  
9 reference to the very particular affidavits submitted by Kolon.  
10 And I wanted to discuss with your Honor, explain to your Honor  
11 why we have -- on the basis of the record there is sufficient  
12 basis for the Court to find personal jurisdiction over Kolon  
13 Industries/Kolon Corp., or at the very least, order  
14 jurisdictional discovery, as would be Du Pont's right on the  
15 present record.

16                   I want to just focus on that, and then there are, I  
17 think, various other, I think, less involved issues that I'd  
18 like to move on to. But if your Honor prefers a different  
19 order or has an area you really want to talk about now, you're  
20 the one making the decision so I will conform myself.

21                   THE COURT: That's fine. I always want to hear what  
22 counsel has to say.

23                   My concern, which I raised with you last time and  
24 really hasn't abated -- in fact, it's increased, as I look at  
25 the papers and contemplate the papers against three additional

C6ceeidc

1 banks and the additional motion against Kolon to, quote,  
2 maintain the status quo -- I ask myself, why is this here? I  
3 can understand assets in New York. You have a judgment and  
4 you're trying to enforce the judgment. And if you have an  
5 uncooperative defendant, huge as it is, you go looking for  
6 assets wherever they can be found and you pursue those assets.  
7 And so if there are assets in New York, you pursue the assets  
8 in New York. Okay.

9 The remarkable thing about this case is you have this  
10 huge defendant with over a billion dollars worth of worldwide  
11 revenue a year, turns over revenue at an enormous pace, very  
12 large company. You have personal jurisdiction over that  
13 company in Virginia. You've gotten some very favorable rulings  
14 from the judge in Virginia, including keeping track of assets,  
15 watching dispositions of amounts in excess of \$250,000, details  
16 about all of the bank accounts in Korea. No assets pointed out  
17 to me in New York. And yet there is a multiplicity of motions  
18 being made to the Court in New York, including some that are,  
19 you know, really out there, like the motion to compel Kolon to  
20 maintain the status quo where there, at the very least, is a  
21 question about personal jurisdiction.

22 So you come to a court in New York and say, well, we  
23 maintain that we have personal jurisdiction and maintain --  
24 tell Kolon to maintain the status quo. What does that add, one  
25 would ask, to what you can reasonably get or have gotten from

C6ceeidc

1 the judge in Virginia, who plainly has personal jurisdiction  
2 over Kolon in Virginia? Would Kolon listen to me more than to  
3 the judge in Virginia? Are you going to make, you know --  
4 plainly, you are -- a series of continuing motions to the Court  
5 in New York when you got the defendant in Virginia?

6 And I raised this last time. It has the aspect of  
7 multiplying the proceedings without a good basis. As I said,  
8 if there were assets in New York that you wanted to seize in  
9 New York, that's one thing. To come to New York as simply a  
10 second front in the battle against Kolon and to try and  
11 establish personal jurisdiction over Kolon, and then to use  
12 that to get the same relief that you could get against Kolon in  
13 Virginia, one would ask, why? I realize that the amount  
14 involved in the judgment is huge, but that doesn't justify huge  
15 legal fees and multiplying the legal fees.

16 There is a footnote in Kolon's brief that says, you  
17 know, Judge, you could simply state all of this and await for  
18 the applications to be made in Virginia. I haven't done that,  
19 and I wouldn't do it without briefing. But that has a certain  
20 appeal.

21 One would ask, why New York? Why not California? Why  
22 not Texas? What's the about basis for bringing what is now,  
23 today, three motions before me and three more in the wings  
24 against other banks and who knows what else?

25 So that's a preliminary observation. And, again, I

C6ceeidc

1 don't want to throw you off from the argument that you wanted  
2 to make. It is a concern.

3 MR. KIM: No, I appreciate that, Judge. And I'd like  
4 to sort of address that head on first, before we move to the  
5 personal jurisdiction points, if I may.

6 THE COURT: Sure.

7 MR. KIM: Your Honor, I think in fairness, the various  
8 bank motions that we have brought, we think we explained a bit  
9 last time, but I really need to clarify that we are not just  
10 trying to multiply motions on the Court's calendar. The fact  
11 is that we had suggested that those motions, the restraints and  
12 the banks being on notice, were necessary, but that the Court  
13 put them aside so that neither the banks nor Du Pont would have  
14 to expend legal fees, and the Court wouldn't have to expend its  
15 time pending adjudication of the Kolon motion.

16 Now, I think it's immensely important to sort of  
17 contextualize why we're doing what we're doing. What we are  
18 trying to do in New York may really make the difference between  
19 this judgment debtor, who's really been the victim of a crime  
20 in getting adequately compensated in any reasonable period of  
21 time or not.

22 First, with respect to your Honor's questions about  
23 the banks, why move against the banks? Why not just do a  
24 proceeding in Virginia against Kolon? Well, the fact is,  
25 Judge, that Kolon has a big portion of its assets, cash in

C6ceeidc

1 these banks. And obviously for a judgment creditor that's the  
2 most feasible thing to try to seize. Not a whole lot you can  
3 do with a factory that's in rural Korea. I'm not sure if I  
4 could disassemble, bring it over here and give it to Du Pont.  
5 So the cash obviously is a very important component.

6 THE COURT: A garnishment order, that, you could get.  
7 The company has huge revenues which it turns over.

8 MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor. And we are moving against  
9 customers, but I think with respect to the cash, I think it is  
10 reasonable obviously for a judgment creditor to be focused on  
11 the loose cash that the debtor has. Now --

12 THE COURT: And if you have personal jurisdiction,  
13 which you do, over Kolon in Virginia, why could not the judge  
14 in Virginia be asked to require Kolon to turn over money that  
15 it has control of in banks? Exactly what you're asking me to  
16 do.

17 MR. KIM: Correct, it could, but I think there are a  
18 couple of things I'd like to really clarify there.

19 First of all, with respect to the banks, it's a fact  
20 that Kolon has sent reports of what it supposedly has in these  
21 banks and yet has consistently refused to allow those banks to  
22 confirm or verify any of it. I think even that fact alone  
23 should be worrisome and is worrisome.

24 THE COURT: But you're not answering the question.  
25 Why not ask the judge in Virginia to require Kolon to turn over

C6ceeidc

1 money that it has in banks? The judge has already required  
2 Kolon to tell you what banks, what accounts, how much money.  
3 You've determined what the accounts are, what the numbers are.  
4 You've determined that there's over \$70 million in banks in  
5 Korea, and you have a judgment debtor before the Court in  
6 Virginia. Have you even asked?

7 MR. KIM: No. We have moved here for a turnover  
8 order, Judge.

9 THE COURT: Why?

10 MR. KIM: Well, a few different reasons, Judge.

11 First, because the statute explicitly permits us to do  
12 so. This is different from a forum shopping argument  
13 prefiling, where judges can legitimately ask, isn't this case  
14 better litigated elsewhere, based on convenience of witnesses,  
15 knowledge of the judge, etc? And a federal statute explicitly  
16 allows the judgment creditor to register the judgment in other  
17 jurisdictions. And if there is personal jurisdiction or other  
18 in rem jurisdiction, etc., it is completely legitimate for  
19 different districts to be involved in judgment --

20 THE COURT: I know, I know, but I would suspect that  
21 the legislative history of that statute would indicate that you  
22 register judgments in different jurisdictions so that you can  
23 get assets in those jurisdictions easily. It's not for the  
24 purpose of getting jurisdiction over the -- or pursuing the  
25 judgment debtor, whom you're pursuing in the district where you

C6ceeidc

1 have a judgment.

2                   And it's not the case where, as in *Gucci*, which you  
3 like to cite to me, there is a default judgment. And so you've  
4 got a -- you know, you've got a fly-by-night debtor who's never  
5 appeared, and you have to go to districts to try and enforce a  
6 judgment.

7                   Here you have an established company, personal  
8 jurisdiction and, you know, of course, I understand the  
9 argument, we've made the motion because we could and the  
10 statute allows us to do it. We've registered. We're pursuing  
11 it, and we're here because the statute gives us the right to be  
12 here.

13                  And the corollary to that is, Judge, we have a right  
14 to make the motion, and it's your duty to decide it.

15                  MR. KIM: And you have the right to deny it,  
16 obviously.

17                  THE COURT: And I understand that.

18                  MR. KIM: Let me try to persuade you, because I  
19 understand where your Honor is coming from. And if I were in  
20 your shoes, obviously, if I felt that -- you know, we are  
21 working through a lot for personal jurisdiction, I understand  
22 that. Your Honor spends a lot of time on it. Counsel spends a  
23 lot of time on it. And it is a legitimate question, why are we  
24 doing this in New York and not Virginia, okay?

25                  First of all, the Virginia --

C6ceeidc

1                   THE COURT: Because --

2                   MR. KIM: Go ahead, Judge.

3                   THE COURT: -- you have the preliminary question in  
4 New York whether there's personal jurisdiction.

5                   MR. KIM: Correct.

6                   THE COURT: The question -- which doesn't exist in  
7 Virginia. So you have to move through all of these  
8 preliminaries in New York to get to the point where you are in  
9 Virginia.

10                  And the one question which I -- you know, I've asked  
11 you last time, I pondered the answer and I still don't  
12 understand the answer, why not seek the relief in Virginia? I  
13 mean --

14                  MR. KIM: I'm going to give you that answer.

15                  THE COURT: Great.

16                  MR. KIM: So, first of all, the Virginia court does  
17 not have jurisdiction over the banks, as far as I can tell. We  
18 are --

19                  THE COURT: Okay. But we're talking about why is --  
20 you've told me, put the bank stuff on hold. Let's get to  
21 Kolon, and you can decide the issues with respect to Kolon.  
22 And once you've decided the issues with respect to Kolon, then  
23 you can begin to make orders against Kolon and everything will  
24 be fine.

25                  My question is: Why not ask for that relief in

C6ceeidc

1 Virginia, where you don't have to go through all the  
2 preliminaries to say, let's get jurisdiction over Kolon? And  
3 to give you a window, I think you've made some showing with  
4 respect to jurisdiction in New York, but I don't think that  
5 it's sufficient. So you will have jurisdictional discovery  
6 with respect to Kolon in New York, jurisdictional discovery.  
7 I'll give you 60 days to do jurisdictional discovery to  
8 establish that Kolon is present in New York. So 60 days hence,  
9 in New York, you will be at the point where you are in  
10 Virginia. And for some reason, which you still haven't told me  
11 but you promised to tell me --

12 MR. KIM: I promise.

13 THE COURT: -- why you want to ask the judge in  
14 New York rather than the judge in Virginia, or indeed, ask them  
15 both. But if you ask the judge in Virginia, then the judge in  
16 New York may well say, well, wait a moment, you already asked  
17 the judge in Virginia.

18 MR. KIM: I don't like to ask two judges for the same  
19 thing. I think at least one of them thinks their time is being  
20 wasted. But --

21 THE COURT: That's all we do, by the way. Never rely  
22 on an argument of time with respect to me, because we have all  
23 of the time in the world. All we do is to decide cases; if not  
24 yours, someone else's. So ...

25 MR. KIM: Well, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, I

C6ceeidc

1 think whether this case is in New York or Virginia might very  
2 well make the difference between whether this judgment creditor  
3 gets compensated in a reasonable period of time or not. And  
4 the simple fact is, Judge, just to be very straight with you,  
5 Virginia law is very undeveloped in this area as to foreign  
6 assets owned by a foreign judgment debtor. I believe that the  
7 face of the Virginia turnover statute -- because, as your Honor  
8 knows, federal courts borrow or import debtor creditor laws of  
9 the state in which the district sits. I believe Virginia have  
10 a turnover statute, should afford a similar remedy.

11           But as your Honor knows, because of New York being  
12 what it is and the center of a lot of international commerce, a  
13 number of very complicated issues that can arise with respect  
14 to various assets that are overseas and whether a foreign  
15 judgment debtor can be ordered by a US District Court to give  
16 up those foreign assets have been litigated extensively in the  
17 Second Circuit and in New York State and all been answered  
18 conclusively, such that a jurist sitting in New York, whether  
19 it's your Honor or another Part I judge on a number of issues I  
20 know Kolon's able lawyers will bring up over the next few  
21 months, really simply need only look at the case law and will  
22 have ready answers to a majority, if not all of the questions  
23 that will arise.

24           What will happen in Virginia if I were to have applied  
25 there first, we have a capable judge there. Obviously I would

C6ceeidc

1 get a full and fair hearing. But what would happen is that,  
2 number one, we would get into a long and protracted debate over  
3 Virginia law in this area with respect to foreign debtor with  
4 foreign assets.

5 And then secondly, there are literally scores of other  
6 issues with respect to particular assets, the reach of the  
7 Court's power, etc., that New York itself spent really the last  
8 few decades working its way through that are not answered in  
9 Virginia.

10 Now, I'm going to advocate my positions there, if  
11 that's where your Honor ultimately sends me; I hope not. And  
12 by the time I'm done, we may or may not have a just result for  
13 the judgment creditor here. And that's why I'm doing it; not  
14 because I'm a New York lawyer and I wanted something to do.  
15 I've got plenty of things to do. I could do it in Virginia or  
16 here, but I really thought for the fair adjudication of a  
17 judgment creditor who's faced with a judgment debtor that is  
18 really doing the following, by their own admission, the bond,  
19 the appellate bond costs 40-something million dollars a year.  
20 By their own admission, even the self-reported figures, they  
21 have transferred \$500 million over the last several months.  
22 They can afford to bond this judgment, yet they have not. They  
23 can afford to pay part of this judgment, yet they have not.  
24 They purport to give asset disclosures but consistently refuse  
25 to allow any third party to verify them.

C6ceeidc

1                   And of course your Honor is familiar with the original  
2 facts that led to the judgment. This is not a simple  
3 commercial dispute. There is a heavy enough section with  
4 criminal activity here.

5                   So that's the primary reason that I brought this in  
6 New York, because I thought without New York law, we may really  
7 very well have a situation where you may have a number of well  
8 intentioned judges presiding over this, but because of the  
9 context of Virginia law and other issues, we may just be mired  
10 over the next several months in arguing out issues that are  
11 quickly resolved here.

12                  And secondly, since the Virginia court doesn't have  
13 jurisdiction over the banks, if Kolon essentially refuses to  
14 give these irrevocable instructions to the banks, as it  
15 basically is telling the Court it would be some kind of Korean  
16 crime for them to do so, because I think that's a pretty good  
17 indication that they don't have a desire or a plan to comply  
18 with a US District Court order with respect to these  
19 instructions -- I don't understand it either, Judge. That's  
20 just what they said.

21                  THE COURT: Because I hadn't read any of the papers  
22 before me to suggest that a customer of a bank could not order  
23 a bank to turn over records, turn over --

24                  MR. KIM: I agree. It doesn't comport with common  
25 sense for Kolon to suggest that it would be some type of

C6ceeidc

1 violation of Korean law for a customer to basically disclose  
2 his own assets to third parties.

3 But be that as it may, I think the -- the situation we  
4 would have down in Virginia, not only the problems with --  
5 against the judgment debtor, but because we don't have  
6 jurisdiction over any of the banks, when Kolon -- not if, when  
7 Kolon does not issue these instructions, there will have been  
8 many months. And we'll have nothing actually restraining the  
9 banks, no actual legal action against the banks, which is also  
10 an untenable situation.

11 So I knew we have to have something against the banks.  
12 And so I was choosing between having a Virginia turnover  
13 application and the perilous set of New York bank applications  
14 all before two judges somehow trying to coordinate the two or  
15 having the New York -- where I believe there is personal  
16 jurisdiction, or there will be, unless your Honor sees the  
17 discovery hopefully -- having a New York judge preside over all  
18 the bank applications and a New York turnover application, such  
19 that if the New York judge deems it appropriate, the bank  
20 applications can be put on hold with the banks, obviously on  
21 legal notice of what's happening. And then if there is a  
22 turnover order against Kolon, the bank applications fall away.

23 But if Kolon does not comply with the Court's orders,  
24 as it very well might not, the bank applications have to be  
25 pursued anyway.

C6ceeidc

1                   So ultimately I thought for these two reasons --  
2 first, New York law itself doing justice here; and secondly,  
3 the fact that the banks have to be involved anyway -- that this  
4 was really, in fact, the most efficient thing for my client,  
5 and really the system.

6                   THE COURT: Are you so unsatisfied with the available  
7 remedies in Korea?

8                   MR. KIM: Yes. If you assume we're a profit  
9 maximizing rational actor, based on all the information we've  
10 received, we do not believe it's a pragmatic solution at this  
11 point. And I think a US District Court judgment now really has  
12 to be enforced in the US courts, or at least elsewhere outside  
13 of Korea. And that's why we're doing what we're doing.

14                  So I hope that answers your Honor's question about why  
15 I filed all this paper and why we're doing it this way. I  
16 think it will make a big difference at the end of the day where  
17 we are.

18                  THE COURT: It's hard -- okay. I mean, I accept  
19 plainly what you say. It's hard to believe that it is an open  
20 question in other jurisdictions, whether if you have personal  
21 jurisdiction over a debtor you can order the debtor to comply  
22 with the orders of the Court.

23                  MR. KIM: I'm with you, Judge. I feel that way, but  
24 there are a number of -- New York itself took a long time to  
25 work through that question, partly because of foreign

C6ceeidc

1 exemptions. There are foreign debtor creditor laws that  
2 purport to give certain types of exemptions on their  
3 applicability when a debtor here is being ordered to give up  
4 foreign assets. That's been one big area of a lot of judicial  
5 sort of contemplation.

6 There are various other areas that come up, but I  
7 agree with your Honor, if a party is before the Court and  
8 subject to the Court's jurisdiction, the Court really should be  
9 able to tell that party to do anything, including bring assets  
10 from the other side of the planet here. But that issue itself  
11 is an issue of legislative construction on that particular  
12 turnover statute.

13 THE COURT: All right. I understand. *Koehler* itself  
14 was four to three on the power of the Court to order production  
15 of assets outside of New York.

16 MR. KIM: That's right. And I think the problem here,  
17 Judge, is that the power, the turnover power against the debtor  
18 is a creature of state statute and not the common law. So your  
19 Honor would be, I'd say, unqualifiedly mathematically correct,  
20 if we're just talking about a court's inherent equitable power  
21 for a person before it. I think the complication becomes when  
22 these legislature enact these turnover laws, each with a  
23 slightly different wording. Then the judges have to construct  
24 whether the legislature wanted different result. And that is  
25 really what causes the complication in this area of the law,

C6ceeidc

1 which New York has worked, really worked decades to work  
2 through and really answer virtually almost every question that  
3 one could raise in this pretty complicated area.

4 THE COURT: All right.

5 MR. KIM: So ultimately I submit it will save the  
6 Court a lot more time once we're past the personal jurisdiction  
7 point to adjudicate this dispute.

8 Now, I had planned a whole discussion about personal  
9 jurisdiction and why you should give me discovery, but I'm  
10 going to skip that because one of the first things I was taught  
11 at the US Attorney's Office when I first learned how to do it  
12 is to move on from anything that you decided. And I wanted  
13 to --

14 THE COURT: If it's decided in your favor.

15 MR. KIM: Correct, Judge. So I think with respect to  
16 the other issues, if your Honor wants to hear something about  
17 the Hague Convention --

18 THE COURT: About what?

19 MR. KIM: About the Hague Convention issue. Obviously  
20 from your Honor's jurisdictional and discovery decision, I  
21 think we've -- that issue is necessarily resolved in our favor.

22 THE COURT: I'm not impressed by the argument under  
23 the Hague Convention any more than I was impressed by your  
24 initial argument that Kolon's -- what I'll call special  
25 appearance to resist the order against Shinhan Bank subjected

C6ceeidc

1 them to general personal jurisdiction.

2 MR. KIM: I agree that I should have been more  
3 specific and you shouldn't have -- you should not have been  
4 impressed by that branch of the argument. But there is  
5 actually a little bit more there.

6 THE COURT: It was an argument that really shouldn't  
7 have been made only to be abandoned in reply.

8 MR. KIM: Well, actually, I wasn't going to abandon  
9 the argument wholesale.

10 Here's the part that you may be -- is a real issue  
11 sort of within that bracket, which is I agree that the filing  
12 of the brief in the bank turnover proceeding itself does not  
13 trigger wholesale general in personam jurisdiction, which would  
14 expose Kolon to kind of, you know, any kind of liability or any  
15 kind of order that the Court with want to fashion.

16 However, as your Honor knows, the Federal Rules of  
17 Civil Procedure, when they were enacted, did not explicitly,  
18 did not provide for a special appearance. 4(e) explicitly  
19 actually just does not happen. So the cases that talk about  
20 what happens if you, quote/unquote, specially appear in a  
21 federal case, borrow from the quasi in rem case law for the  
22 state in which that district sits.

23 And here, while I agree with your Honor that the mere  
24 fact that Kolon filed a brief in the Shinhan proceeding itself  
25 should not trigger automatic in personam jurisdiction

C6ceeidc

1 generally, what I would submit is by the same quasi in rem  
2 principles in the cases Kolon has cited, that if the Court were  
3 to fashion an order adjudicating Kolon's rights and obligations  
4 with respect to the property at issue in those proceedings,  
5 i.e. Kolon being ordered to do things with those bank accounts,  
6 that actually would be an appropriate exercise in personal  
7 jurisdiction under *International Shoe* principles; because, as  
8 your Honor knows, when a party comes in even objecting to  
9 personal jurisdiction, what happens is when the Court  
10 adjudicates various issues, even with respect to that special  
11 appearance in the quasi in rem proceeding, they're bound by it.  
12 They can't later collaterally attack it.

13 So when a party is coming in under the quasi in rem  
14 case law to say that, I believe that XYZ should be done with  
15 the property instead, the Court can adjudicate that narrow set  
16 of issues and bind the party to it.

17 Now, what I would suggest your Honor is that while  
18 your Honor is correct that Kolon should not be subject to just  
19 endless in personam jurisdiction generally as a result of their  
20 having injected themselves into the bank turnover proceeding, I  
21 would submit that they have subjected themselves to the Court's  
22 power in terms of the Court issuing interim relief with respect  
23 to the bank accounts themselves; in other words, what Kolon  
24 should do with the bank accounts, instructions issued to the  
25 banks, disclosure in the banks and so forth.

C6ceeidc

1                   And I think that comports with the very principles of  
2 the quasi in rem case law that this Court would borrow from  
3 New York State case law, which is when the party comes in and  
4 says, I want to participate in the adjudication of this piece  
5 of property, they are subjecting themselves to the Court's  
6 jurisdiction insofar as that property goes.

7                   THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

8                   MR. KIM: So, your Honor, I think that really leads to  
9 the injunction against Kolon. I suppose the Court could be  
10 thinking of it one of two ways. If you're ordering  
11 jurisdictional discovery, you might be thinking that you want  
12 the jurisdiction at discovery complete first before you take up  
13 the interim injunction to preserve assets. That's one  
14 approach, obviously.

15                   THE COURT: It's a prerequisite. I wouldn't have the  
16 right to issue such a new order if I had no personal  
17 jurisdiction over Kolon. The law says there's no personal  
18 jurisdiction. It's a matter which is certainly disputed.

19                   MR. KIM: What I would suggest, your Honor, is that  
20 your Honor does have the power and should issue the interim  
21 order, even while the personal jurisdiction is taking place  
22 with respect --

23                   THE COURT: By the way, your turnover order that you  
24 request wasn't limited to, for example, the Shinhan Bank  
25 account in which there was a special appearance. It's all --

C6ceeidc

1 essentially all --

2 MR. KIM: The turnover order against Kolon is premised  
3 upon -- I believe there's both personal and general  
4 jurisdiction otherwise.

5 THE COURT: Yeah. So the argument of sort of general  
6 personal jurisdiction based upon their appearance being the  
7 equivalent of a motion to intervene, I mean, it was just wrong.

8 MR. KIM: I think with respect to the bank accounts  
9 it's right. I think with respect to the injunction on the bank  
10 accounts, which are the very property that's the subject of the  
11 quasi in rem proceedings, as Kolon calls them, I think it's  
12 right.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

14 MR. KIM: So what I'm suggesting, your Honor, with  
15 respect to the bank accounts, the injunction, is that while  
16 your Honor -- while I understand what your Honor is saying is  
17 that to just issue a blanket order against Kolon generally  
18 would require a finding of in personam jurisdiction, that could  
19 only follow an analysis after jurisdictional discovery.

20 With respect to the bank accounts themselves, what I  
21 would suggest is that your Honor issue the injunction that we  
22 request or some variation thereof to preserve the bank accounts  
23 and to give instructions for disclosure to the banks. Because  
24 I think that would actually be narrowly tailored to hit  
25 precisely the subject, the res, essentially, of the proceeding

C6ceeidc

1 in which they brought themselves in.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

3 MR. KIM: So there arises sort of the practical  
4 question of what to do with the bank disclosure application  
5 against Shinhan, and that there are others obviously in the  
6 pipeline.

7 It seems to me, Judge, that the set of questions there  
8 are very much intertwined in one important aspect with the  
9 question of whether Kolon, A, will be ordered to turn over the  
10 information in the banks, in other words, to give these  
11 instructions to the banks; and B, whether it will comply.

12 In the following sense that if Kolon let's say doesn't  
13 comply and doesn't issue these instructions, then I think  
14 Du Pont would be able to say to the Court that there really is  
15 no other way we're going to get this information. Shinhan Bank  
16 is the only possessor of this information, since Kolon refuses  
17 to give it up.

18 THE COURT: I don't understand why the information  
19 that you're seeking from Shinhan is different from the  
20 information that the judge has required to be provided to you  
21 in Virginia.

22 MR. KIM: It shouldn't be, but the difference is it  
23 comes from a third party that is verifiable. I think that's  
24 the reason that all these judgment enforcement discovery  
25 devices allow us to get information from banks; because when

C6ceeidc

1 the debtor says these are all the people I've transferred it  
2 to, this is all the money I have, we should be able to just get  
3 a bank to tell us that's true.

4 THE COURT: Has the judge in Virginia required that  
5 you be given bank statements as opposed to simply the report of  
6 the debtor?

7 MR. KIM: He has not required it. Kolon has provided  
8 summaries of what it has in its banks and its bank activity,  
9 but not the actual -- whatever they might make and say it's  
10 bank statements.

11 Judge, I also want you to understand the context,  
12 because it does seem ridiculous if I'm saying IBM sent me a  
13 document, I'm not sure if it's true, but that's not what we  
14 have here. We actually have a 90-page spoliation evidence  
15 opinion, because these people were basically destroying  
16 documents and making things up.

17 THE COURT: Sure, but there are -- yes. I mean, I  
18 understand about fraudulent statements. But one would think  
19 that if there was a question whether the statements in the  
20 accounts are true, the judge who ordered that you be given the  
21 accounts, if you have reason to believe that the information is  
22 not accurate, would follow up with such things as copies of the  
23 bank statements, yes. Can they be doctored? Yes. But, you  
24 know --

25 MR. KIM: But I don't know how I would ever be able to

C6ceeidc

1 tell that a bank statement or a self-reporting of a bank  
2 transfer would be inaccurate, other than comparing it against  
3 the extra records from the bank.

4 THE COURT: It would really be foolhardy, wouldn't it,  
5 with a judgment of over \$900 million which is not going away  
6 unless it goes away on appeal, to be producing fraudulent bank  
7 statements? It's not as though Du Pont is going away.

8 MR. KIM: No more foolhardy than actually engaging in  
9 a criminal conspiracy to steal the trade secrets in the first  
10 place, which they have done.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. KIM: Or to doctor and make up documents, which  
13 they have done in front of a federal judge.

14 So I think, Judge -- I just want you to know, I mean,  
15 I might sound paranoid if I say I want to verify it with the  
16 banks, but that's what I'm trying to do.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. KIM: I think there's no other practical solution.

19 So I think practically, what do we do with these bank  
20 disclosure applications? It seems to me even if you deny it  
21 and say Shinhan is sort of, you know, under all this Korean law  
22 pressured, therefore it's not appropriate to put them in this  
23 awkward position, if and when Kolon refuses to give these  
24 instructions to Shinhan to, you know, disclose information,  
25 etc., we'll just be back here basically saying, now the

C6ceeidc

1 balancing of the factors are such that we have no other  
2 recourse except to get it from Shinhan; whereas right now we  
3 can't say that because the Kolon matter has not been fully  
4 adjudicated.

5 So it seems to me the only practical thing to do with  
6 these turnover applications is we could do it twice -- I'm  
7 sorry, the disclosure applications in the banks, we could do it  
8 twice and have another set of applications when Kolon refuses  
9 to give these instructions, or we could have these bank  
10 disclosures adjudicated after the Kolon disclosure order of the  
11 injunction is adjudicated and Kolon refuses to comply, at which  
12 point then it would become fully ripe and adjudicated once.

13 THE COURT: Sufficient unto the day, you know, I have  
14 an application before me, and I'll decide it based upon what's  
15 before me now, all of them.

16 MR. KIM: So I think on the --

17 THE COURT: I think you should finish up, because I  
18 really have to listen to the other parties before I decide.  
19 And --

20 MR. KIM: I think my time is better used in addressing  
21 any new points they bring up now.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. DASSOFF: Good morning, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Good morning.

25 MR. DASSOFF: I'm going try to keep my comments brief.

C6ceeidc

1           There are three issues I want to talk about. The  
2 first one is to talk about the circumstances under which Kolon  
3 specially appeared in the Shinhan preliminary injunction  
4 hearing. And you need to put that in context to really  
5 understand what happened.

6           Du Pont has conducted extensive discovery in Virginia.  
7 It has the right to do so post judgment. It has asked for  
8 extensive financial documents. We have produced, I've been  
9 told, over 7,000 pages of those documents, most, if not all, in  
10 Korean. Whether they include the bank statements or not, I'm  
11 not sure. It would be easy for me to find out, but I believe  
12 they do. If they don't, they can ask for them.

13           So the notion that somehow we're not being honest or  
14 that we need a second look to confirm the accuracy of what's  
15 being certified under oath by an officer of Kolon to Du Pont on  
16 an almost daily basis under the order in Virginia, I think, is  
17 a bit misleading.

18           The circumstances of their action against Shinhan here  
19 are interesting.

20           THE COURT: Could I just pause for a moment.

21           One of the things I do this morning when I'm on Part I  
22 is I do attorney admissions. Knowing the motions I have on  
23 this morning, which is also part of Part I, I sense that there  
24 are people in the courtroom who are here for attorney  
25 admissions, not just for the motions.

C6ceeidc

1           It's not necessary to stand, by the way. You're  
2 welcome to take seats in the jury box. And when I'm told by my  
3 deputy that everyone is here for attorney admissions, we'll  
4 break in the argument on the motions and do the attorney  
5 admissions.

6           Go ahead.

7           MR. DASSOFF: Thank you, your Honor.

8           So Du Pont went in ex parte and, I mean, really  
9 ex parte. I've practiced for 31 years. I think I've only seen  
10 this done two or three times. I've never done it myself. They  
11 gave no notice to Kolon. They gave no notice to Shinhan when  
12 they went into court. We take issue with and believe that they  
13 exaggerated and, in fact, other facts, we think, are just plain  
14 false. But when they made their motion for the temporary  
15 restraining order in front of Judge Stein, he granted that  
16 motion.

17           Shinhan had all of six days, calendar days, to file  
18 its opposition. By the time we found out about that motion and  
19 the order, that relief that Judge Stein had granted, I believe  
20 we had two or three business days to respond. It was clear to  
21 us that Shinhan had not engaged counsel. We didn't even know  
22 if they would file opposition. As it turns out, their  
23 opposition consisted of about a two- or two-and-a-half page  
24 letter to the Court asking for additional time. We had no idea  
25 whether the Court was going to grant that additional time. We

C6ceeidc

1 didn't see that letter until we had already prepared and filed  
2 with the Court our motion, or our opposition.

3 So those were the circumstances. We made clear to  
4 this court in every appearance, telephonically and in person,  
5 in our applications to appear pro hac vice, in our briefs, in  
6 every single situation that it was a limited appearance and  
7 that we were not submitting the jurisdiction.

8 We disagree about a lot of issues in this case, your  
9 Honor. We do. But interesting, there are some issues we don't  
10 disagree about, and I think they're important ones. We don't  
11 disagree that to find general jurisdiction here in New York,  
12 under Section 301, there has to be continuous, systematic and  
13 substantial contact. And I think on the evidence before you,  
14 it's clear there isn't.

15 Were this Court to find general jurisdiction over  
16 Kolon in New York, here's what it would mean: It would mean  
17 that any plaintiff anywhere in this country, and I would argue  
18 in the world, can come to New York and sue Kolon for acts that  
19 occurred outside of New York; anywhere in the world, if you  
20 find Kolon is subject to general jurisdiction here in New York.

21 So what was Du Pont's proof in its motion of general  
22 jurisdiction or specific jurisdiction? Three things, they  
23 argue. And this is from Mr. Kim's declaration that was  
24 attached to their motion.

25 The first was that Kolon USA is a subsidiary of Kolon

C6ceeidc

1 located in New Jersey through which Kolon markets and sells its  
2 products in the US, and upon information and belief --

3 THE COURT: I told Mr. Kim I'm inclined to believe  
4 that there is an insufficient showing of jurisdiction over  
5 Kolon, general jurisdiction or specific jurisdiction, but I'm  
6 inclined to allow discovery. There is some evidence of  
7 activity in New York.

8 There are the existence of the subs. Whether they  
9 rise to the level of sufficient agency is something that I  
10 certainly couldn't find in favor of Kolon at this point. It is  
11 odd that a company the size of Kolon with the subs in New York,  
12 you know, was not doing business in New York. But I certainly  
13 couldn't find that. On the other hand, I would be inclined to  
14 allow the discovery to go forward to see where the facts indeed  
15 lie with respect to that.

16 MR. DASSOFF: And, your Honor, I understand that. I  
17 understand the Court's comments. I respect them. I understand  
18 you're trying to do the right thing. On the other hand --

19 THE COURT: The right thing is not something out there  
20 in the cloud. The issue is whether on the facts and the law,  
21 what is the more correct result? And there is plain case law  
22 with respect to the preliminary showing with respect to  
23 jurisdiction. I don't sit here as some arbiter attempting to  
24 do the, quote, right, unquote, thing. I simply go through the  
25 papers and attempt to decide the issues that come before me in

C6ceeidc

1 the most correct way on the facts of the law. And, you know,  
2 I'm here to follow the law. I don't just attempt to sit and do  
3 what I think is, quote, the right thing.

4 MR. DASSOFF: I meant right procedurally; in other  
5 words, giving Du Pont an opportunity, what I will characterize  
6 as a second bite at the apple.

7 There are two cases that we've cited, the R-quest vs.  
8 Kimberly Carse case and the Stutz case, where the same exact  
9 posture that our case is in, the courts found they hadn't  
10 presented a *prima facie*, let alone a substantial case.

11 And Du Pont had every opportunity. This isn't a case  
12 where they just got a judgment and they showed up the next week  
13 in court in New York. They've taken extensive discovery in  
14 Virginia post judgment on Kolon's assets so that they should  
15 have been fully armed when they came in here. They've made no  
16 showing at all to this Court that there's personal jurisdiction  
17 over Kolon here. I don't think they get another chance. There  
18 are no offices, never have been, for Kolon Industries in  
19 New York. It has no officers, no employees in New York. Never  
20 has. It's never registered to do business. It has no license.  
21 It has no post office box. It has no phone number. If you  
22 look up directory assistance or a phone book, you're not going  
23 to find its name. It has no contact with New York, and that's  
24 been true forever.

25 So they knew all those things. And what they gave you

C6ceeidc

1 was a declaration based on information and belief, in two  
2 cases, and the third where they tried to argue for specific  
3 jurisdiction was the citation to an allegation, conclusory  
4 allegation in the complaint. That's all the evidence they gave  
5 you.

6 And the reply didn't add to that, your Honor. We've  
7 given you declarations that are factual. They're supported,  
8 and I think they make it clear that under no circumstances  
9 could there be general or specific jurisdiction here in  
10 New York.

11 So I would suggest to the Court that much as the Court  
12 in R-quest did that on that record, your Honor has more than  
13 enough evidence, applying the legal standard that needs to be  
14 applied here, to deny this motion.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. DASSOFF: Thank you, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Shinhan?

18 MR. TRACHTENBERG: Good morning again, your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Good morning. Good to see you.

20 MR. TRACHTENBERG: Thank you.

21 So I ask myself, how much does this Court need to hear  
22 about the balancing test in order to --

23 THE COURT: The answer is I'm inclined to not compel  
24 compliance with the subpoena, but I don't mean to cut you off.

25 MR. TRACHTENBERG: Well, your Honor, needless to say,

C6ceeidc

1 that will allow me to be much briefer than I might be. I'll  
2 simply point out a few points very quickly in the effort to  
3 solidify your inclination.

4 THE COURT: In the hope that I don't change my mind  
5 from the time you start to speak and the time you finish?

6 MR. TRACHTENBERG: That's always a risk.

7 So I will simply point out that your Honor properly  
8 observed that *Gucci* itself, Du Pont's leading case, makes it  
9 clear that the factors that are -- balancing of the factors  
10 supports the denial of the motion.

11 And in particular I would like to just emphasize one  
12 point, which is that the fourth factor provides expressly,  
13 according to Du Pont, that if the information sought can easily  
14 be obtained elsewhere, there is little or no reason to require  
15 a party to violate foreign law. And I would simply observe  
16 that this is no small matter.

17 What Du Pont is asking the Court to do is to require a  
18 nonparty, nonparties to this proceeding, to violate the law of  
19 their home country. And there's no allegation that these banks  
20 have engaged in any wrongdoing, but Du Pont apparently  
21 considers it not a big stretch for an American court to tell a  
22 party to go and break the law. And that should only be done  
23 under emergency circumstances. And for all of the reasons your  
24 Honor has noted, that's not the case here.

25 There are ample other alternatives. And the Court has

C6ceeidc

1 pointed to one this morning, when it observed that there's a  
2 very simple solution for Du Pont, which is that it could ask  
3 the Virginia court to expressly require that copies of the  
4 Shinhan Bank statements and other bank bank statements be  
5 produced, together with whatever other information is being  
6 produced.

7                   *Gucci* makes it clear that --

8                   THE COURT: Kolon suggested to me that many of those  
9 statements have been required to be produced already. I can't  
10 tell from what the lawyers have told me what the detail is in  
11 terms of actual bank records that have been produced in  
12 Virginia.

13                   MR. TRACHTENBERG: Nor do I know whether those records  
14 have been produced. But if they haven't been, Kolon certainly  
15 can be ordered to provide them. So *Gucci* goes with us on that  
16 fourth factor.

17                   *Gucci* also tells us that the importance of the  
18 documents of a particular litigation is vital. The documents  
19 have to be vital to the litigation before a nonparty can be  
20 ordered to violate foreign law.

21                   Here, as we've indicated in our brief, Du Pont has  
22 told the Court that Kolon has billions of dollars available in  
23 Korea. And as your Honor observed the last time we were here,  
24 we're talking about \$3.5 million or thereabouts that may be  
25 located at the Shinhan banks. And you already determined that

C6ceeidc

1 there's no likelihood of success on the turnover motion. So  
2 the records are only potentially necessary if you change your  
3 mind on that score, or if Du Pont goes to Korea to seek  
4 enforcement. And we know from the declaration of Judge Cho  
5 that has been submitted that there are proceeds in Korea that  
6 are available, and that they include a preattachment freeze to  
7 reserve the status quo.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. TRACHTENBERG: And your Honor has already  
10 considered the hardship issue and come down in favor of the  
11 banks on that. So we respectfully request that you not change  
12 your mind and that you deny this motion.

13 THE COURT: Okay. I'm prepared to decide the motions,  
14 but let me first do the attorney admissions. So the parties in  
15 Du Pont are welcome to remain seated at the counsel table or  
16 take a break. This usually takes about a half an hour, maybe  
17 less. So you're welcome to sit there, take a break, relax.

18 MR. KIM: We'll come back in half an hour, if that's  
19 okay with the Court.

20 THE COURT: Better make it 20 minutes.

21 (Recess)

22 THE COURT: Okay. Du Pont. I'm prepared to decide.

23 The plaintiff, E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Company,  
24 brings three motions in this judgment enforcement action.  
25 First, the plaintiff moves for a turnover order against

C6ceeidc

1 judgment debtor Kolon Industries, Inc. and Kolon Corp  
2 (collectively "Kolon") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
3 Procedure 69(a)(1) and New York Civil Practice Law and Rules,  
4 ("CPLR") Section 5225(a).

5 Second, the plaintiff moves for an order requiring  
6 Kolon to preserve the status quo with respect to assets held at  
7 certain banks and compelling Kolon to give its written consent  
8 for the banks to comply with subpoena seeking discovery.

9 Third, the plaintiff moves to compel discovery from  
10 garnishees Shinhan Bank and Shinhan Financial Group Co.,  
11 Limited (collectively "Shinhan") pursuant to subpoenas issued  
12 pursuant to Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

13 The current dispute arises from a civil action brought  
14 by the plaintiff against Kolon Industries, Inc. in the Eastern  
15 District of Virginia alleging misappropriation of trade secrets  
16 and other related causes of action. Following a jury verdict  
17 in Du Pont's favor, the United States District Court for the  
18 Eastern District of Virginia entered a judgment in favor of  
19 Du Pont against Kolon in the amount of \$919.9 million in  
20 compensatory damages and \$350,000 in punitive damages.

21 On April 10, 2012, that Court granted Du Pont's motion  
22 for permission to register the judgment elsewhere pursuant to  
23 28 U.S.C. Section 1963. And on April 13, 2012, Du Pont  
24 registered the judgment in this court.

25 The plaintiff now seeks to enforce its judgment

C6ceeidc

1 against Kolon. Kolon Industries, Inc. is a global company  
2 based in South Korea that manufactures and markets various  
3 industrial materials. The plaintiff asserts that, following a  
4 corporate restructuring, Kolon Industries, Inc. is also known  
5 as Kolon Corp. or Kolon Corporation. The plaintiff thus brings  
6 the present motions against both entities, and Kolon has not  
7 sought to draw a distinction among those corporate entities for  
8 purposes of the pending motion.

9 The plaintiff previously brought two motions directed  
10 against garnishee Shinhan: A motion for a turnover order  
11 pursuant to CPLR Section 5225(b) and a motion for a preliminary  
12 injunction ordering Shinhan to restrain Kolon's assets.

13 On June 1, 2012, this Court, sitting as Part I, denied  
14 the plaintiff's preliminary injunction motion and stayed the  
15 plaintiff's turnover motion against Shinhan pending the  
16 resolution of the present turnover motion against Kolon.

17 The plaintiff first moves for a turnover order against  
18 Kolon. Under Rule 69(a)(1) a federal district court has the  
19 authority to enforce a judgment by attaching property in  
20 accordance with the law of the state in which the district  
21 court sits. *Koehler v. Bank of Bermuda, Ltd.* ("Koehler I"),  
22 544 F.3d 78, 85 (2d Cir. 2008). CPLR Section 5225(a) provides  
23 that, quote, "where it is shown that the judgment debtor is in  
24 possession or custody of money or other personal property in  
25 which he has an interest, the Court shall order that the

C6ceeidc

1 judgment debtor pay the money or so much of it as is sufficient  
2 to satisfy the judgment to the judgment creditor." New York  
3 CPLR Section 5225(a).

4 The defendant first argues that the plaintiff failed  
5 to serve the turnover motion papers on Kolon in compliance with  
6 the requirements of the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad  
7 of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents and Civil or Commercial  
8 Matters ("the Hague Convention"). However, in connection with  
9 the underlying action in the Eastern District of Virginia,  
10 Kolon agreed to waive Hague Convention service and stipulated  
11 that its counsel would accept service on its behalf.

12 Stipulated Order for Extension of Time, *E.I. Du Pont de Nemours*  
13 & Co. v. Kolon Industries, Inc., No. 09 Civ 58 (E.D. Va.  
14 February 26, 2009), ECF No. 4.

15 Because this judgment enforcement proceeding is simply  
16 a continuation of the underlying action in the Eastern District  
17 of Virginia, this waiver of service should remain effective.  
18 Moreover, because a turnover proceeding against the judgment  
19 debtor under CPLR Section 5225(a), unlike a turnover proceeding  
20 against a garnishee under CPLR Section 5225(b), can be  
21 initiated by motion and does not require commencement of a new  
22 proceeding -- see *Wasserman Media Group, LLC v. Bender*, 10 Civ  
23 8783, 2012 WL 1506181 at 2, (S.D.N.Y. April 26, 2012) -- the  
24 Hague Convention's service requirements should not apply here  
25 in any event. See *SEC v. Credit Bankcorp, Ltd*, No. 99 Civ.

C6ceeidc

1 11395, 2011 WL 666158, at 4 (S.D.N.Y. February 14, 2011  
2 (concluding that the Hague Convention "only applies to the  
3 initial service of process, namely the summons, not subsequent  
4 judicial documents" and concluding that service of subsequent  
5 documents need only comply with the Federal Rule of Civil  
6 Procedure 5) (citing *Volkswagenwerk Akiengesellschaft v.*  
7 *Schlunk*, 486 U.S. 694, 700 (1988) (finding that the drafting  
8 history of the Hague Convention "supports our view that Article  
9 I of the convention refers to service of process in the  
10 technical sense")); see also *S&S Machine Corp v. Wuhan Heavy*  
11 *Duty Machinery Tool Group Co., Ltd.*, No. 07 Civ. 4909, 2012 WL  
12 958528 at 6 n.11 (E.D.N.Y. January 13, 2012) (same), report and  
13 recommendation adopted in part, 2012 WL 958527 (E.D.N.Y.  
14 March 21, 2012).

15 In this case the plaintiff served the documents  
16 relating to the present turnover motion by e-mailing them to  
17 the defendant's attorney and by sending them via express mail  
18 and registered mail, return receipt requested, to Kolon's  
19 headquarters in Korea. (Kim Reply Declaration, paragraph 5.)  
20 The defendant does not contend that the service was defective  
21 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 or otherwise defective  
22 apart from the Hague Convention requirements that the defendant  
23 has already waived. Thus, there is no basis to conclude that  
24 service of the present turnover motion was defective.

25 The defendant next argues that the Court lacks

C6ceeidc

1 personal jurisdiction over Kolon in order to issue a turnover  
2 order against Kolon pursuant to CPLR Section 5225(a). This  
3 Court must have personal jurisdiction over Kolon. See, for  
4 example, *SEC v. Softpoint, Inc.*, No. 95 Civ. 2951, 2012 WL  
5 1681167, at 2 to 3 (S.D.N.Y. May 9, 2012.)

6 In a federal question case involving an out-of-state  
7 defendant, the district court applies the forum state's  
8 personal jurisdiction rules if the federal statute does not  
9 specifically provide for national service of process. *PDK*  
10 *Labs v. Friedlander*, 103 F.3d 1105, 1108 (2d Cir. 1997).

11 Here, the statute pursuant to which the judgment is  
12 rendered -- 28 U.S.C. Section 1963 -- does not provide for a  
13 nationwide service of process; thus, the Court must determine  
14 whether New York law allows the exercise of personal  
15 jurisdiction, and if so, whether the exercise of such  
16 jurisdiction comports with the constitutional due process  
17 guarantees. See *Estate of Unger v. Palestinian Authority*, 400  
18 F. Supp. 2d 541, 547 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (concluding that when  
19 enforcing a judgment registered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section  
20 1963, the appropriate measure of personal jurisdiction is the  
21 forum state's long-arm statute).

22 The plaintiff first contends that Kolon submitted to  
23 this Court's personal jurisdiction by appearing in the prior  
24 turnover proceeding against garnishee Shinhan. The plaintiff  
25 argues that Kolon's appearance in the Shinhan turnover

C6ceeidc

1 proceeding was functionally equivalent to an intervention which  
2 it contends is fundamentally incompatible with an objection to  
3 personal jurisdiction. However, under New York law a  
4 non-domiciliary judgment debtor "may protect his interest in  
5 attached property without submitting to false in personam  
6 jurisdiction." *In Re Gaming Lottery Securities Litigation*, No.  
7 96 Civ 5567, 2000 WL 1801840, at 4, (S.D.N.Y. December 7,  
8 2000.) Section 320(c) of CPLR provides for limited appearances  
9 for defendants contesting levies on their property. Thus,  
10 Section 320 sanctions the use of a limited appearance and  
11 permits the defendant in a quasi in rem action, such as a  
12 garnishment proceeding, to answer and to protect his interest  
13 in the attached property without submitting to full in personam  
14 jurisdiction and risking a personal judgment. *Cargill, Inc. v.*  
15 *Sabine Trading and Shipping Co., Inc.*, 756 F.2d 224, 228 (2d  
16 Cir. 1985); see also *Gager v. White*, 425 N.E.2d 851, 856, n.10,  
17 (N.Y. 1981) (in a quasi in rem action, "the defendant is  
18 permitted to defend without submitting to in personam  
19 jurisdiction"); *Weininger v. Castro*, 462 F. Supp. 2d 457, 492  
20 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (characterizing garnishment proceedings as  
21 quasi in rem actions.) Thus, by entering a special appearance  
22 to oppose the Shinhan turnover motion, Kolon did not submit to  
23 the personal jurisdiction of this Court. See *In re Gaming*  
24 *Securities Litigation*, 2000 WL 1801840 at 2 and 4 to 5  
25 (defendant who opposed turnover proceeding against third-party

C6ceeidc

1 garnishee under CPLR Section 5225 did not submit to court's  
2 personal jurisdiction). Indeed, the plaintiff did not return  
3 to this argument in its reply brief.

4 The plaintiff next contends that Kolon has sufficient  
5 contacts with New York so as to render this Court's  
6 jurisdiction proper. The defendant contends that no such  
7 context exists, asserting that both Kolon Industries, Inc. and  
8 Kolon Corp. are foreign corporations based in South Korea, and  
9 that neither entity has offices, employees, bank accounts or  
10 assets in New York. (Jung declaration, paragraphs 10 and 12.)  
11 The plaintiff asserts that this Court has general jurisdiction  
12 over Kolon under an agency theory, because Kolon is present and  
13 doing business in New York by virtue of the activities of its  
14 subsidiaries Kolon USA and Kolon I'Networks. However, the  
15 parties strenuously dispute the extent to which these  
16 subsidiaries actually conduct business in New York, as well as  
17 the extent to which they carry out the business of and perform  
18 functions for Kolon.

19 The papers and supporting affidavits submitted by the  
20 plaintiff do not establish that these subsidiaries do "all the  
21 business which Kolon could do were it here by its own  
22 officials," which would be required to conclude that the  
23 alleged agents subjected Kolon to general personal jurisdiction  
24 in New York. *Frummer v. Hilton Hotels International, Inc.*, 227  
25 N.E.2d 851, 854 (N.Y. 1967).

C6ceeidc

1                   The plaintiff has also failed to make a sufficient  
2 showing that the Court has jurisdiction over Kolon based on  
3 Kolon's own activities. The plaintiff contends that Kolon  
4 itself conducts sufficient business in New York to subject it  
5 to general jurisdiction, but the papers and supporting  
6 affidavits submitted by the plaintiff do not make clear whether  
7 the specific entities with which Kolon conducts business are,  
8 in fact, based in New York or elsewhere. See Kim declaration,  
9 paragraph 28, and Exhibit 10; Jung declaration, paragraphs 13  
10 and 15. It is also unclear from the papers submitted whether  
11 any of the tortious conduct that gave rise to the underlying  
12 judgment in the Eastern District of Virginia occurred in  
13 New York, such that specific jurisdiction would be proper under  
14 CPLR Section 302(a)(2).

15                   The plaintiff has thus made an insufficient showing of  
16 personal jurisdiction over Kolon to permit the Court to grant  
17 the relief sought. However, it is appropriate to authorize  
18 jurisdictional discovery to determine the nature and scope of  
19 Kolon's contacts with New York, if any, and to resolve the  
20 disputed factual issues set forth above. See *Daval Steel*  
21 *Products v. M.V. Jurac Dalmatinac*, 718 F.Supp. 159, 162  
22 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (jurisdictional discovery appropriate where  
23 plaintiff makes a "threshold showing that there is some basis  
24 for the assertion of jurisdiction").

25                   Accordingly, the Court will permit the parties to

C6ceeidc

1 engage in jurisdictional discovery for a period of 60 days, and  
2 another conference will be scheduled after the conclusion of  
3 jurisdictional discovery. The plaintiff's motion for a  
4 turnover order is, therefore, denied without prejudice to  
5 renewal after the conclusion of the jurisdictional discovery.  
6 The plaintiff's turnover motion in Shinhan will remain stayed  
7 during this time for jurisdictional discovery.

8 The plaintiff next moves for an order requiring Kolon  
9 to preserve the status quo with respect to assets held at  
10 certain banks and compelling Kolon to give its written consent  
11 for the banks and comply with subpoenas. This motion is also  
12 denied without prejudice to renewal after the conclusion of  
13 jurisdictional discovery because there is an insufficient  
14 showing that the Court has personal jurisdiction to enter this  
15 relief against Kolon.

16 The plaintiff next moves for an order compelling  
17 Shinhan to comply with Rule 45 subpoenas seeking documents  
18 concerning Kolon's accounts at Shinhan Bank. Shinhan asserts  
19 that if it complied with the Rule 45 subpoenas, it would be in  
20 violation of Korean law, namely, The Act on Real Name Financial  
21 Transactions and Guarantee of Secrecy ("the Real Name Act"),  
22 which provides, with certain exceptions, that an employee of a  
23 financial institution may not disclose any material or  
24 information relating to the contents of a financial transaction  
25 without the written consent of the parties to the transaction.

C6ceeidc

1 (Cho declaration, paragraph 13.)

2                   Where a party from whom discovery is sought asserts  
3 that foreign law constitutes a bar to production, courts  
4 perform an international comity analysis to determine whether  
5 to exercise their power to compel discovery. In conducting  
6 this analysis, courts in this Circuit consider a series of  
7 factors set forth in the Restatement (Third) of Foreign  
8 Relations Law of the United States. See, for example, *Gucci*  
9 *America Inc. v. Curveal Fashion*, No. 09 Civ. 8458, 2010 WL  
10 808639 at 2 (S.D.N.Y. March 8, 2010); *Linde v. Arab Bank, PLC*,  
11 262 F.R.D. 136, 149 (E.D.N.Y. 2009).

12                  These factors are: "One, the importance of the  
13 investigation or litigation of the documents or other  
14 information requested; two, the degree of specificity of the  
15 request; three, whether the information originated in the  
16 United States; four, the availability of alternative means of  
17 securing information; and five, the extent to which  
18 noncompliance with the request would undermine important  
19 interests of the United States, or compliance with the requests  
20 would undermine important interests of the state where the  
21 information is located." Restatement (Third) Foreign Relations  
22 Law, Section 442(1)(c).

23                  Courts in this circuit also consider "the hardship of  
24 compliance on the party or witness from whom discovery is  
25 sought and the good faith of the party resisting discovery."

C6ceeidc

1       *Gucci*, 2010 WL 808639 at 2 (quoting *Minpeco S.A. v.*  
2       *Conticommodity Services, Inc.*, 116 F.R.D. 517, 523 (S.D.N.Y.  
3       1987)).

4               Here the balance of these factors weighs heavily  
5       against compelling Shinhان to produce the discovery sought by  
6       the plaintiff.

7               First, the parties appear to agree that the documents  
8       originated outside the United States and are maintained in  
9       Korea, which weighs in favor of Shinhان.

10               Second, with respect to the competing interests of the  
11       United States and Korea, while the United States has an  
12       interest in enforcement of subpoenas, this interest is  
13       diminished to some extent when, as here, the discovery is  
14       requested by private civil litigant and is sought from a third  
15       party. See *Gucci*, 2010 WL 808639 at 5; *Tiffany (NJ) LLC v. Qi*  
16       *Andrew*, 276 F.R.D. 143, 157 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).

17               Next, with respect to the hardship of compliance,  
18       Shinhان has made a showing that it could face civil and  
19       criminal penalties in Korea if it produces the documents  
20       requested by the plaintiff. Shinhان submits a declaration from  
21       a Korean lawyer and former chief judge of the Seoul District  
22       Court, who represents that unauthorized disclosures in  
23       violation of the Real Name Act are punishable by imprisonment  
24       for a term of up to five years and fines in amounts of up to 30  
25       million Korean Won or both. (Cho Declaration, paragraph 13.)

C6ceeidc

1           It is true, as the plaintiff asserts, that some courts  
2 have deemed the possibility of hardship to be speculative,  
3 whereas here the party resisting disclosure does not cite  
4 instances where the sanctions at issue have actually been  
5 imposed in practice. See, for example, *Milliken and Co. v.*  
6 *Bank of China*, 758 F.Supp. 2d 238, 250 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); *Gucci*,  
7 2010 WL 808639 at 7. However, this is not a case where there  
8 is countervailing evidence that the statute in question was  
9 never intended to be enforced in practice. See *In re Air Cargo*  
10 *Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, 278 F.R.D. 51, 53 to 54  
11 (E.D.N.Y. 2010), or that banks have actually complied with the  
12 United States court order compelling production without  
13 negative consequences. See *Tiffany*, 276 F.R.D. at 159.

14           Instead, this is simply a case where the plaintiff's  
15 Korean law expert is not aware of a case on point where  
16 prosecution under the Real Name Act has or has not occurred.  
17 (Jang declaration, paragraph 4.) Nor is this a case where  
18 there are likely to be valid defenses on which Shinhan could  
19 prevail if the Real Name Act were enforced against it. See  
20 *Weiss v. National Westminster Bank*, PLC, 2 F.R.D. 33, 56  
21 (E.D.N.Y. 2007).

22           Although the plaintiff points out that the Real Name  
23 Act has an exception for disclosure pursuant to court orders,  
24 Judge Cho asserts that a Korean court is unlikely to recognize  
25 an order from a New York court as valid for the purposes of

C6ceeidc

1 this exception, and the plaintiff has not rebutted the showing.  
2 (Cho declaration, paragraph 13.) In addition, Shinhan's  
3 "status as a nonparty in this litigation weighs against issuing  
4 an order because an order compelling production should be  
5 imposed on a nonparty, quote, only in extreme circumstances."  
6 *Linde*, 262 F.R.D. at 151 (quoting *Minpeco*, 118 F.R.D. 331, 332.  
7 See also *Tiffany*, 276 F.R.D. at 158. Thus, on balance, the  
8 hardship of compliance weighs in favor of Shinhan. Moreover,  
9 there is no showing that Shinhan has acted with bad faith in  
10 this matter, which also weighs in Shinhan's favor.

11 Furthermore, there are several alternative means of  
12 obtaining the information sought by the plaintiff. First, the  
13 plaintiff could obtain this information directly from Kolon.  
14 It could obtain discovery directly from Kolon in the Eastern  
15 District of Virginia. Indeed, Kolon asserts that during the  
16 course of discovery it has provided the plaintiff with specific  
17 account numbers, deposit balances and the physical addresses of  
18 each branch of the Shinhan Bank holding Kolon's property.  
19 (Chung declaration, paragraphs 8 to 10.) The plaintiff does  
20 not appear to argue that Kolon has refused to comply with the  
21 specific requests for information concerning Kolon's accounts  
22 at Shinhan. The plaintiff also has resorted to the Court in  
23 the Eastern District of Virginia if it found the information  
24 provided by Kolon relating to Shinhan were insufficient.

25 Second, the plaintiff could proceed directly in Korea,

C6ceeidc

1 given that Korean law allows judgment creditors to seek  
2 preliminary attachment of freezes against a judgment debtor's  
3 accounts even before a judgment becomes final and  
4 non-appealable. (Cho declaration, paragraph 11.) The  
5 plaintiff has made no showing of why these alternative methods  
6 would be futile or unduly difficult, and these methods have the  
7 benefit of avoiding the imposition of hardships on Shinhan, an  
8 innocent third party. Thus, this factor also weighs against  
9 compelling Shinhan to comply with the subpoenas.

10 Furthermore, the documents requested are not vital or  
11 of great importance to this judgment enforcement action, given  
12 Kolon's representations that it has already provided  
13 information about its accounts at Shinhan to the plaintiff.

14 Further, as Shinhan points out, Kolon is not a  
15 fly-by-night defendant against whom a default judgment has been  
16 entered but has instead been litigating this case actively in  
17 the Eastern District of Virginia, where it is indisputably  
18 subject to personal jurisdiction. Thus, this is not a case  
19 where the plaintiff's only tool for enforcing the judgment is  
20 to access the defendant's bank accounts. See *Gucci*, 2010 WL  
21 808639 at 3.

22 Moreover, the amounts in Kolon's Shinhan accounts are  
23 relatively small compared to the amount of the judgment and the  
24 other assets of Kolon potentially available to the plaintiff.  
25 Kolon has informed the plaintiff that it holds approximately

C6ceeidc

1       \$71.3 million in deposits in various bank accounts in Korea,  
2       yet it holds only \$3.5 million in its accounts at Shinhan Bank.

3           Moreover, the 3.5 million is a small fraction of the  
4       judgment sought to be enforced, which is in excess of \$920  
5       million. And it is a very small fraction of the defendants'  
6       revenue and worth. This weighs against a conclusion that  
7       documents relating specifically to Kolon's assets at Shinhan  
8       Bank are vital to the plaintiff's ability to enforce a nearly  
9       \$1 billion judgment.

10           The remaining factor, the specificity of the  
11       plaintiff's request, weighs in favor of the plaintiff because  
12       the requests are reasonably specific. However, on balance, the  
13       relevant factors in the comity analysis weigh strongly against  
14       ordering Shinhan to comply with the subpoenas at issue here.  
15       Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion to compel discovery from  
16       Shinhan is denied.

17           The Court has considered all of the arguments of the  
18       parties. To the extent not specifically addressed above, the  
19       remaining arguments are either moot or without merit. For the  
20       foregoing reasons, the plaintiff's motion for a turnover order  
21       against Kolon and the plaintiff's motion for an order  
22       preserving the status quo are denied without prejudice to  
23       renewal after the conclusion of jurisdictional discovery. The  
24       plaintiff's motion to compel discovery from Shinhan is denied.  
25       The Court authorizes jurisdictional discovery for 60 days. The

C6ceeidc

1 clerk is directed to close docket numbers 51 and 55.

2 So ordered.

3 All right. That disposes of all of the motions before  
4 me. Good morning, all.

5 MR. KIM: Thank you for your time, Judge.

6 MR. DASSOFF: Your Honor, the Court in its order had  
7 mentioned a conference, and I wondered, is that conference one  
8 that you want to set a date for or would it be before this  
9 Court?

10 THE COURT: That's a very good question. I  
11 deliberately left out a date for that conference. The parties  
12 should contact the Court and ask for a conference. Whether the  
13 subsequent proceeding should be before me or before the next  
14 Part I judge is something that I'm just not clear about, which  
15 is why I didn't give you a specific date and say, come on down,  
16 come on down before me. It's a matter I want to think about.

17 So you should contact the Court, and whether that  
18 comes back to me or the next Part I judge, whoever the Part I  
19 judge is in two months, is an issue to be decided.

20 MR. DASSOFF: Understood, your Honor. Thank you.

21 MR. KIM: Thank you, Judge.

22 MR. TRACHTENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

23 (Adjourned)